Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1-31 are pending and all claims stand rejected. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended. Applicant contends that no new matter has been added by the claim amendment and, accordingly, entry and approval of same is respectfully requested.

Claim Objection

Section 1 of the Office Action indicates that claim 1 is objected to due to informalities. The Office Action recites that "[t]he last three lines of claim 1 originally stated 'said second mail address in the case that this e-mail is received by said second provider server after transferred by said second provider server,' " and that "[f]or examining purposes it has been changed to read as 'said second mail address in the case that this e-mail is received by said second provider server after transferred by said first provider server.' " The Applicant herein amends claim 1 in accordance with the change used by the Examiner for examination purposes. Accordingly, Applicant contends that amended claim 1 no longer includes informalities and respectfully requests that the objection to claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections

Section 3 of the Office Action indicates that claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,427,164 to Reilly (herein "Reilly") and U.S. Patent No. 6,405,234 to Nielsen (herein "Nielsen"). Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Reilly is directed to systems and methods for automatically forwarding electronic mail when the recipient is otherwise unknown. In Reilly, some or all

participants in the electronic mail process (e.g., the sending user, the sending server, the receiving server, the receiving user, and other participants) are aware of a "forwarding list server." The "forwarding list server" includes information necessary for forwarding electronic mail (e.g., the old electronic mail name and the new electronic mail name). See column 3, lines 12-26 of Reilly. When a receiving server receives electronic mail for an old electronic mail name, the receiving server communicates with the "forwarding list server" to obtain the new electronic mail name and forwards the electronic mail to the new electronic mail name. In addition, the "forwarding list server" may notify the sending user of the new electronic mail name.

Nielsen is directed to methods and systems for updating e-mail addresses. In Nielsen, after a recipient changes his or her e-mail address, the recipient sends information regarding the updated e-mail address to an address-change server. The address-change server stores the updated e-mail information in its database. When a sender wants to reach a recipient whose e-mail address has changed, the sender sends an e-mail message to the address-change server. The address-change server sends a reply e-mail to the sender with the recipient's updated e-mail address using the information stored in the database. The sender then identifies the recipient's updated e-mail address, creates a new e-mail address, inserts the recipient's updated e-mail address into the "to" line of the new message, and sends the new message to the recipient. See abstract and column 2, line 58 through column 3, line 4 of Nielsen.

Applicant's invention, as recited by claim 1, includes the following features (at least one of which is neither disclosed nor suggested by the applied art):

> a first provider server in which a first e-mail address of a client is set;
>
> a second provider server in which a second e-mail address of said client is set; and
>
> an address change notification deputization service server,
>
> wherein said first provider server transfers an e-mail that is sent to said first mail address to said second provider server upon receiving this e-mail,
>
> wherein **said second provider server transfers an e-mail that has been transferred from said first provider server to said address change notification deputization service server upon receiving this e-mail**, and
>
> wherein **said address change notification deputization service server checks the path of the e-mail that has been transferred from said second provider server and makes a notification to the sender of the e-mail to the effect that the e-mail address of said client is said second mail address in the case that this e-mail is received by said second provider server after transferred by said first provider server.**

This means that a first e-mail address for a client is set in a first provider server and a second e-mail address for the client is set in a second provider server. E-mails sent to the first e-mail address are transferred from the first provider server to the second provider server. In addition, e-mails transferred from the first provider server to the second provider server are transferred to an address change notification deputization service server by the second provider server. The address change notification deputization service server checks the path of the e-mail transferred by the second provider server and notifies the sender of the e-mail of the second e-mail address set in the second provider server if the e-mail is received by said second provider server after being transferred by the first provider server.

Neither Reilly nor Nielsen disclose, teach or suggest a second provider server that transfers an e-mail that has been transferred from a first provider server to an address change notification deputization service server. To teach this feature, the

applied reference would have to describe transferring an e-mail from a first provider server to a second provider server to an address change notification deputization service server. In Reilly, a first provider server that receives an e-mail addressed to an unknown or invalid recipient sends a query to a forwarding address server to retrieve a new address for the intended recipient. The first provider server may then transfer the e-mail to the new address set at a second provider server. Reilly, however, is devoid of transferring an e-mail from a first provider server to a second provider server to an address change notification deputization service server.

In Nielsen, when a sender wants to reach a recipient whose e-mail address has changed from an old e-mail address to a new e-mail address, the sender sends an email message with the old e-mail address to an address-change server, which arguably may function as a first provider server. The address-change server includes a list of the old and new e-mail addresses and may return the new address to the sender to resend the e-mail and/or forward the e-mail to a second provider server associated with the new e-mail address. Nielsen, however, is devoid of transferring an e-mail from the first provider server to the second provider server to an address change notification deputization service server.

Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above, neither Reilly nor Nielsen disclose, teach or suggest a second provider server that transfers an e-mail that has been transferred from a first provider server to an address change notification deputization service server.

In addition, neither Reilly nor Nielsen disclose, teach or suggest an address change notification deputization service server that checks the path of an e-mail that is received by a second provider server and notifies the sender of the e-mail if the e-mail is received by the second provider server after being transferred by a first provider server.

In the Office Action, Nielsen is relied upon to teach checking the path of an e-mail that has been transferred from a first provider server to a second provider server. Nielsen, however, does not teach this feature. In Nielsen, when a sender wants to reach a recipient whose e-mail address has changed, the sender sends an

e-mail message directly to an address change server. The address change server then sends the new e-mail address back to the sender. Nielsen, however, is devoid of checking the path of an e-mail that has been transferred from a first provider server to a second provider server. The address change server in Nielsen simply stores updated e-mail address information in a database and sends reply e-mails to the sender with the recipient's updated e-mail address. Therefore, the address change server in Nielsen never checks the path of the e-mail that has been transferred from a second provider server and never checks whether this e-mail is received by the second provider server after transfer by a first provider server. In addition, the address change notification deputization service server of the present invention does not have a database such as the one in the address change server of Nielsen because the address change notification deputization service server of the present invention does not need to check a database for the new address itself because this information is obtained from the path of the transferred e-mail. Additionally, as acknowledged by the Examiner, Reilly does not disclose such features.

Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above, neither Reilly nor Nielsen disclose, teach or suggest an address change notification deputization service server that checks the path of an e-mail that is received by a second provider server and notifies the sender of the e-mail if the e-mail is received by the second provider server after being transferred by a first provider server.

Therefore, as set forth above, Reilly and Nielsen fail to disclose, teach or suggest each and every limitation of claim 1. Namely, Reilly and Nielsen fail to disclose teach or suggest a second provider server that transfers an e-mail that has been transferred from a first provider server to an address change notification deputization service server and an address change notification deputization service server that checks the path of an e-mail that is received by a second provider server and notifies the sender of the e-mail if the e-mail is received by the second provider server after being transferred by a first provider server. Accordingly, Applicant contends that claim 1 is allowable over the applied art and respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Independent claims 10 and 19-31, while not identical to claim 1, include features similar to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant contends that these claims are also allowable over the applied art for the reasons set forth above that claim 1 is allowable and respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Claims 2-9 and 11-18 include all the features of the independent claim from which they depend. Thus, Applicant contends that claims 2-9 and 11-18 are also allowable over the applied art for the reasons set forth above and respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-31 are in condition for allowance and early notification to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel N. Calder

Daniel N. Calder, Reg. No. 27,424
Stephen J. Weed, Reg. No. 45,202
Attorneys for Applicant

SJW/fp

Dated: May 2, 2005

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482-0980
(610) 407-0700

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment to Deposit Account No. **18-0350** of any fees associated with this communication.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:

May 2, 2005 Jean Petrillo

FP_I:\MTS\3299US\AMEND_01.DOC